

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-16, 28, and 29 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 9, 11, and 12 have been amended, and claims 30-32 have been canceled. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and prompt early allowance are respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 9-14 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claims 9, 11, and 12 have been amended to cure the deficiencies in the claims, and claims 30-32 have been canceled. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Stone *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,101,510 (hereinafter "Stone"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Stone fails to teach a mechanism included in the core engine to extend behaviors of the core engine. The Office Action alleges that Stone teaches a HTML viewer that is considered to be a core engine (col.16 lines 64-67) for providing categories of behaviors including layout and rendering behaviors. However, Stone fails to disclose a mechanism that is included in the HTML viewer that can extend selected categories of behavior of the HTML viewer with behaviors of the same category of at least one external component.

There is not a mechanism taught by Stone that has the functionality of the mechanism claimed in claim 1, and there is no disclosure of such a mechanism being included in the HTML viewer.

Moreover, Stone fails to disclose extending core engine behaviors with “behaviors of the same category” of at least one external component. There is no teaching by Stone to show that core engine behaviors are being extended with external component behaviors of the same category as the extended core engine behaviors. Therefore, Stone fails to teach this limitation.

Additionally, Stone fails to disclose an external component participating with the core engine, wherein participating includes the external component “delegating some processing of the behaviors of the same category to the core engine.” There is no language in Stone to show that an external component can delegate some processing of the behaviors to the core engine. Again, the Office Action alleges that the HTML viewer is the core engine, however, there is no evidence to show that an external component participates with the HTML viewer, and more specifically, there is no evidence to show that an external component delegates some processing of the behaviors of the same category to the HTML viewer. Therefore, Stone fails to teach the claimed invention.

Claim 28 is a computer-readable medium claim that includes features analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 1 and therefore defines over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-3, 7-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone and further in view of Weis *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,161,126 (hereinafter “Weis”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The applicant's invention and the Stone reference have been commonly assigned to the Microsoft Corporation. References that qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) but that have a common assignee as the claimed invention do not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

"Effective November 29, 1999, subject matter which was prior art under former 35 U.S.C. 103 via 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is now disqualified as prior art against the claimed invention if that subject matter and the claimed invention 'were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.'" (See MPEP 706.02(k)).

The Stone reference, therefore, is disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-3, 7-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone, Weis, and further in view of Ramaley *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,585,777 (hereinafter "Ramaley"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Again, applicant's invention and the Stone reference have been commonly assigned to the Microsoft Corporation. The Stone reference is disqualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for the same reasons stated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-6, 11, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome and claims 1-16, 28, and 29 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner believes that any issues remain, the Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that are required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.19-2112 referencing MFCP 87510.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov. 9, 2005


Richard D. Jordan
Reg. No. 33,519

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613
Telephone (816) 474-6550
Facsimile (816) 421-5547